

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated April 8, 2004, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on June 8, 2004. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 21-39 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 21, 22, 27 and 33 have been amended. Claims 22-26 are indicated to be allowable by the Examiner, if rewritten in independent form and with resolution of the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection. Claims 27-39 are indicated to be allowable by the Examiner with resolution of the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for reasons presented below.

Claims 21-39 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 21-32 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/050,654. A terminal disclaimer is herein attached. Withdrawal of the provisional rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) in view of George, et al., U.S. Patent Publication 20020018849, herein "*George*," on grounds that the claimed invention is anticipated by processes disclosed in *George*. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

George discloses a chemical vapor deposition (CVD) process to form a silicon dioxide film by continuously and simultaneously co-flowing silicon and oxygen precursors with a catalyst, such as ammonia. *George* alone or in combination, does not teach, show, or suggest a method for depositing a metal-containing film to a substrate within a process chamber by an atomic layer deposition technique, comprising introducing a precursor to the process chamber, adsorbing the precursor to the substrate, purging the process chamber with a purge gas, introducing a process gas comprising the precursor and a reactant, reacting the adsorbed precursor with the process gas to deposit the metal-containing film, and purging the process chamber with

the purge gas, as recited in claim 21. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In conclusion, the reference cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, does not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

Having addressed all issues set out in the Final Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Tackett
Registration No. 32,008
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant